IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 17TH JULY 2007 / 26TH ASHADHA 1929

OP.No. 31739 of 2000(C)

PETITIONER:

G.SRIKRISHNA BHAT,
S/O. SBRAYA BHAT, RESIDING
AT GUMPE IN BAYAR VILLAGE OF
KASARAGOD TALUK AND DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.K.SHRIHARI RAO

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **THE STATE OF KERALA, REP.BY THE SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, TRIVANDRUM.**

2. **THE COMMISSIONER, LAND REVENUE, TRIVANDRUM.**

3. **THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KASARAGOD AT KANHANGAD.**

4. **THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR (LA) MANJESHWAR, KASARAGOD.**

5. **G.SUBRAMANYA BHAT, S/O.ACHUTAH BHAT, RESIDING AT GUMPE IN BAYAR VILLAGE AND POST KASARAGOD TALUK.**

BY ADV. SRI.K.G.GOURI SANKAR RAI
BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.T.B.RAMANI

THIS ORIGINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 17/07/2007, ALONG WITH OP.31779/2000 THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER ON CMP. NO.54054/2000 IN OP. NO.31739/2000

DISMISSED

17.07.2007 SD/- THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1:- COPY OF THE ASSIGNMENT ORDER DT. 28.2.86 OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT WITH ENGLISHE TRANSLATION.

EXT.P2:- COPY OF THE APPLICATION DT. 6.10.90 FILED BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXT.P3:- COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 6.10.94 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXT.P4:- COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 31.5.97 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXT.P5:- COPY OF THE APPLICATION DT. 19.1.2000 OF THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.P6:- COPY OF THE ORDER DT. 25.9.2000 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

tss

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, J.

O.P.Nos.31739 & 31779 OF 2000

Dated this the 17th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

These writ petitions are filed by the same person against the orders, by which, revisions and appeals under the Land Assignment Rules have been rejected on the ground of delay. The appeals were filed with application to condone delay, without explicitly stating any reason that could be treated as sufficient cause to condone delay. After those appeals were dismissed, revisions were filed again with applications to condone delay, without any excusable reason. The statutory authorities have rejected the revisions also. That apart, no specific case is discernible on the merits, except from the bald assertion that the petitioner had been in possession of the land in question following his ancestors. There is no shut of material on record to conclude in this way. I do not find any jurisdictional error or legal infirmity in the orders impugned in these writ petitions.

In the result, these writ petitions are dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN,
Judge

kkb.

==========

THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN, J

O.P.NOs.31739 & 31779 OF 2000

JUDGMENT

17TH JULY, 2007.

==========